

INVARIANTS RELATED TO THE TREE PROPERTY

NICHOLAS RAMSEY

ABSTRACT. We consider cardinal invariants related to Shelah’s model-theoretic tree properties and the relations that obtain between them. From strong colorings, we construct theories T with $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) > \kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) + \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T)$. We show that these invariants have distinct structural consequences, by investigating their effect on the decay of saturation in ultrapowers. This answers some questions from [10].

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the fundamental discoveries in stability theory is that stability is local – a theory is stable if and only if no formula has the order property. Among the stable theories, one can obtain a measure of complexity by associating to each theory T its *stability spectrum*, namely, the class of cardinals λ such that T is stable in λ . A classification of stability spectra was given by Shelah in [10, Chapter 3]. Part of this analysis amounts showing that stable theories do not have the tree property and, consequently, that forking satisfies local character. But a crucial component of that work was studying the approximations to the tree property can exist in stable theories and what structural consequences they have. These approximations were measured by a cardinal invariant of the theory called $\kappa(T)$, and Shelah’s stability spectrum theorem gives an explicit description of the cardinals in which a given theory T was stable in terms of the cardinality of the set of types over the empty set and $\kappa(T)$. Shelah used the definition of $\kappa(T)$ as a template for quantifying the global approximations to other tree properties in introducing the invariants $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T)$, $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T)$, and $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T)$ which bound approximations to the tree property (TP), the tree property of the first kind (TP₁), and the tree property of the second kind (TP₂), respectively. Eventually, the local condition that a theory does not have the tree property (*simplicity*), and the global condition that $\kappa(T) = \kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) = \aleph_0$ (*supersimplicity*) proved to mark substantial dividing lines. These invariants provide a coarse measure of the complexity of the theory, providing a “quantitative” description of the patterns that can arise among forking formulas. They are likely to continue to play a role in the development of a structure theory for tame classes of non-simple theories.

Motivated by some questions from [10], we explore which relationships that obtain between the *local* properties TP, TP₁, and TP₂ also hold for the *global* invariants $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T)$, $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T)$, and $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T)$. In short, we are pursuing the following analogy:

local	TP	TP ₁	TP ₂
global	κ_{cdt}	κ_{sct}	κ_{inp}

This continues the work done in [2], where, with Artem Chernikov, we considered a global analogue of the following theorem of Shelah:

Theorem. [10, III.7.11] For complete theory T , $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) = \infty$ and only if $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) = \infty$ or $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T) = \infty$. That is, T has the tree property if and only if it has the tree property of the first kind or the tree property of the second kind.

Shelah then asked if $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) = \kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) + \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T)$ in general [10, Question III.7.14]¹. In [2], we showed that is true under the assumption that T is countable. For a countable theory T , the only possible values of these invariants are $\aleph_0, \aleph_1$, and ∞ – our proof handled each cardinal separately using a different argument in each case. Here we consider this question without any hypothesis on the cardinality of T , answering the general question negatively:

Theorem. There is a theory T so that $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) \neq \kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) + \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T)$. Moreover, it is consistent with ZFC that for every regular uncountable κ , there is a theory T with $|T| = \kappa$ and $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) \neq \kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) + \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T)$.

To construct a theory T so that $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) \neq \kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) + \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T)$, we use results on *strong colorings* constructed by Galvin under GCH and later by Shelah in ZFC. These results show that, at suitable regular cardinals, Ramsey's theorem fails in a particularly dramatic way. The statement $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) = \kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) + \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T)$ amounts to saying that a certain large global configuration gives rise to another large configuration which is moreover very uniform. This has the feel of many statements in the partition calculus and we show that, in fact, a coloring $f : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow 2$ can be used to construct a theory $T_{\kappa, f}^*$ such that the existence of a large inp- or sct-patterns relative to $T_{\kappa, f}^*$ implies some homogeneity for the coloring f . The theories built from the strong colorings of Galvin and Shelah, then, furnish ZFC counter-examples to Shelah's question, and also give a consistency result showing that, consistently, for every regular uncountable cardinal κ , there is a theory T with $|T| = \kappa$ and $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) \neq \kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) + \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T)$. This suggests that the aforementioned result of [2] for countable theories is in some sense the optimal result possible in ZFC.

Our second theorem is motivated by the following theorem of Shelah:

Theorem. [10, VI.4.7] If T is not simple, $\mathcal{D}$ is a regular ultrafilter over I , M is an $|I|^{++}$ -saturated model of T , then $M^I/\mathcal{D}$ is not $|I|^{++}$ -compact.

In an exercise, Shelah claims that the hypothesis that T is not simple in the above theorem may be replaced by the condition $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T) > |I|^+$ and asks if $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) > |I|^+$ suffices [10, Question VI.4.20]. We prove the following:

Theorem. There is a theory T so $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T) = \lambda^{++}$ yet for any regular ultrafilter $\mathcal{D}$ on λ and λ^{++} -saturated model of T , $M^\lambda/\mathcal{D}$ is λ^{++} -saturated. On the other hand, if $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ and $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) > \lambda^+$, M is an λ^{++} -saturated model of T and $\mathcal{D}$ is a regular ultrafilter over λ , then $M^\lambda/\mathcal{D}$ is not λ^{++} -compact.

This contradicts Shelah's Exercise VI.4.19 and *a fortiori* answers Question VI.4.20 negatively. Although $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T) > |I|^+$ and hence $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) > |I|^+$ do not suffice to guarantee a loss of saturation in the ultrapower, one can ask if $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) > |I|^+$

¹This formulation is somewhat inaccurate. Shelah defines for $x \in \{\text{cdt}, \text{inp}, \text{sct}\}$, the cardinal invariant κ_{T_x} , which is the least regular cardinal $\geq \kappa_x$. Shelah's precise question was about the possible equality $\kappa_{T_{\text{cdt}}} = \kappa_{T_{\text{sct}}} + \kappa_{T_{\text{inp}}}$. For our purposes, we will only need to consider theories in which κ_x is a successor cardinal, so we will not need to distinguish between these two variations.

does suffice. Shelah's original argument for Theorem 5.4 does not generalize, but fortunately a recent new proof due to Malliaris and Shelah [8] does and we point out how the revised question can be answered by an easy and direct adaptation of their argument. These results suggest that the rough-scale asymptotic structure revealed by studying the λ^{++} -compactness of ultrapowers on λ is global in nature and differs from the picture suggested by the local case considered by Shelah.

In order to construct these examples, it is necessary to build a theory capable of coding a complicated strong coloring yet simple enough that the invariants are still computable. This was accomplished by a method inspired by Medvedev's QACFA construction [9], realizing the theory as a union of theories in a system of finite reducts each of which is the theory of a Fraïssé limit. The theories in the finite reducts are $\aleph_0$ -categorical and eliminate quantifiers and one may apply the Δ -system lemma to the finite reducts arising in global configurations. Altogether, this makes computing the invariants tractable.

Acknowledgements: This is work done as part of our dissertation under the supervision of Thomas Scanlon. We would additionally like to acknowledge very helpful input from Artem Chernikov, Leo Harrington, Alex Kruckman, and Maryanthe Malliaris. Finally, we would like to give special thanks to Assaf Rinot, from whom we first learned of Galvin's work on strong colorings.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notions from Classification Theory.

Definition 2.1. We recall the following definitions, introduced in [10].

- (1) A *cdt-pattern of height κ* is a sequence of formulas $\varphi_i(x; y_i)$ ($i < \kappa$, i successor) and numbers $n_i < \omega$, and a tree of tuples $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}}$ for which
 - (a) $p_\eta = \{\varphi_i(x; a_{\eta|_i}) : i \text{ successor}, i < \kappa\}$ is consistent for $\eta \in \omega^\kappa$
 - (b) $\{\varphi_i(x; a_{\eta \smallfrown \langle \alpha \rangle}) : \alpha < \omega, i = l(\eta) + 1\}$ is n_i -inconsistent.
- (2) An *inp-pattern of height κ* is a sequence of formulas $\varphi_i(x; y_i)$ ($i < \kappa$), sequences $(a_{i,\alpha} : \alpha < \omega)$, and numbers $n_i < \omega$ so that
 - (a) for any $\eta \in \omega^\kappa$, $\{\varphi_i(x; a_{i,\eta(i)}) : i < \kappa\}$ is consistent.
 - (b) For any $i < \kappa$, $\{\varphi_i(x; a_{i,\alpha}) : \alpha < \omega\}$ is n_i -inconsistent.
- (3) An *sct-pattern of height κ* is a sequence of formulas $\varphi_i(x; y_i)$ ($i < \kappa$) and a tree of tuples $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}}$ so that
 - (a) For every $\eta \in \omega^\kappa$, $\{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\eta|_\alpha}) : 0 < \alpha < \kappa, \alpha \text{ successor}\}$ is consistent.
 - (b) If $\eta \in \omega^\alpha, \nu \in \omega^\beta, \alpha, \beta$ are successors, and $\nu \perp \eta$ then $\{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_\eta), \varphi_\beta(x; a_\nu)\}$ are inconsistent.
- (4) For $X \in \{\text{cdt}, \text{sct}, \text{inp}\}$, we define $\kappa_X^n(T)$ be the first cardinal κ so that there is no X -pattern of height κ in n free variables. We define $\kappa_X(T) = \sup\{\kappa_X^n(T)\}$.

Example 2.2. Fix a regular uncountable cardinal κ and let $L = \langle E_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ be a language consisting of κ many binary relations. Let T_{sct} be the model companion of the L -theory asserting that each E_α is an equivalence relation and $\alpha < \beta$ implies E_β refines E_α . Let T_{inp} be the model companion of the L -theory which only asserts that each E_α is an equivalence relation. Now $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T_{\text{sct}}) = \kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T_{\text{sct}}) = \kappa^+$, and further $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T_{\text{sct}}) = \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T_{\text{inp}}) = \kappa^+$. However, we have $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T_{\text{sct}}) = \aleph_0$ and $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T_{\text{inp}}) = \aleph_1$.

In order to simplify many of the arguments below, it will be useful to work with indiscernible trees and arrays. Define a language $L_{s,\lambda} = \{\triangleleft, \wedge, <_{\text{lex}}, P_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$

where λ is a cardinal. We may view the tree $\kappa^{<\lambda}$ as an $L_{s,\lambda}$ -structure in a natural way, interpreting $<$ as the tree partial order, $\wedge$ as the binary meet function, $<_{lex}$ as the lexicographic order, and P_α as a predicate which identifies the α th level. See [2] and [7] for a detailed treatment.

Definition 2.3.

- (1) We say $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \kappa^{<\lambda}}$ is an *s-indiscernible tree over A* if

$$\text{qftp}_{L_{s,\lambda}}(\eta_0, \dots, \eta_{n-1}) = \text{qftp}_{L_{s,\lambda}}(\nu_0, \dots, \nu_{n-1})$$

implies $\text{tp}(a_{\eta_0}, \dots, a_{\eta_{n-1}}/A) = \text{tp}(a_{\nu_0}, \dots, a_{\nu_{n-1}}/A)$.

- (2) We say $(a_{\alpha,i})_{\alpha < \kappa, i < \omega}$ is a *mutually indiscernible array* over A if, for all $\alpha < \kappa$, $(a_{\alpha,i})_{i < \omega}$ is a sequence indiscernible over $A \cup \{a_{\beta,j} : \beta < \kappa, \beta \neq \alpha, j < \omega\}$.

Fact 2.4. [2] Let $(a_\eta : \eta \in \kappa^{<\lambda})$ be a tree s-indiscernible over a set of parameters C .

- (1) All paths have the same type over C : for any $\alpha, \nu \in \kappa^\lambda$, $\text{tp}((a_{\eta|_\alpha})_{\alpha < \lambda}/C) = \text{tp}((a_{\eta|_\nu})_{\nu < \lambda}/C)$.
- (2) Suppose $\{\eta_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma\} \subseteq \kappa^{<\lambda}$ satisfies $\eta_\alpha \perp \eta_{\alpha'}$ whenever $\alpha \neq \alpha'$. Then the array $(b_{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha < \gamma, \beta < \kappa}$ defined by

$$b_{\alpha,\beta} = a_{\eta_\alpha \frown \langle \beta \rangle}$$

is mutually indiscernible over C .

Fact 2.5. [1], [2]

- (1) If there is an inp-pattern of height κ modulo T , then there is an inp-pattern $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$, $(a_{\alpha,i})_{\alpha < \kappa, i < \omega}$ so that $(a_{\alpha,i})_{\alpha < \kappa, i < \omega}$ is a mutually indiscernible array.
- (2) If there is an sct-pattern (cdt-pattern) of height κ modulo T , then there is an sct-pattern (cdt-pattern) $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha)$, $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}}$ so that $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}}$ is an s-indiscernible tree.

2.2. Fraïssé Theory. We will recall some basic facts from Fraïssé theory, from [4]. Let L be a finite language and let $\mathbb{K}$ be a non-empty finite or countable set of finitely generated L -structures which has HP, JEP, and AP. Such a class $\mathbb{K}$ is called a *Fraïssé class*. Then there is an L -structure D , unique up to isomorphism, such that D has cardinality $\leq \aleph_0$, $\mathbb{K}$ is the age of D , and D is ultrahomogeneous. We call D the *Fraïssé limit* of $\mathbb{K}$, which we sometimes denote $\text{Flim}(\mathbb{K})$. We say that $\mathbb{K}$ is *uniformly locally finite* if there is a function $g : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ so that a structure in $\mathbb{K}$ generated by n elements has cardinality at most $g(n)$. If $\mathbb{K}$ is a countable uniformly locally finite set of finitely generated L -structures and $T = \text{Th}(D)$, then T is $\aleph_0$ -categorical and has quantifier-elimination.

Fact 2.6. [5] Let A be a countable structure. Then A is ultrahomogeneous if and only if it satisfies the following extension property: if B, C are finitely generated and can be embedded into A , $f : B \rightarrow A$, $g : B \rightarrow C$ are embeddings then there is an embedding $h : C \rightarrow A$ so that $h \circ g = f$.

The following is a straight-forward generalization of [5, Proposition 5.2]:

Lemma 2.7. Suppose $L \subseteq L'$, and $\mathbb{K}$ is a Fraïssé class of L -structures and $\mathbb{K}'$ is a Fraïssé class of L' -structures satisfying the following two conditions:

- (1) $A \in \mathbb{K}$ if and only if there is a $D' \in \mathbb{K}'$ so that A is an L -substructure of $D' \upharpoonright L$.
- (2) If $A, B \in \mathbb{K}$, $\pi : A \rightarrow B$ is an L -embedding, and $C \in \mathbb{K}'$ with $C = \langle A \rangle_{L'}^C$, then there is a $D \in \mathbb{K}'$ with $D = \langle B \rangle_{L'}^D$ and an L' -embedding $\tilde{\pi} : C \rightarrow D$ extending π .

Then $\text{Flim}(\mathbb{K}') \upharpoonright L = \text{Flim}(\mathbb{K})$.

Proof. Let $F' = \text{Flim}(\mathbb{K}')$ and suppose $F = F' \upharpoonright L$. Fix $A_0, B_0 \in \mathbb{K}$ and an L -embedding $\pi : A_0 \rightarrow B_0$. Suppose $\varphi : A_0 \rightarrow F$ is an L -embedding. Let $E = \langle \varphi(A_0) \rangle_{L'}^{F'}$. Up to isomorphism over A_0 , there is a unique $C \in \mathbb{K}'$ containing A_0 so that $C = \langle A_0 \rangle_{L'}^C$ and $\tilde{\varphi} : C \rightarrow F'$ is an L' -embedding extending φ and with $E = \tilde{\varphi}(C)$. By hypothesis, there is some $D \in \mathbb{K}'$ with $B_0 \subseteq D$ and $D = \langle B_0 \rangle_{L'}^D$ and there is an L' -embedding $\tilde{\pi} : C \rightarrow D$ extending π . By the extension property for F' , there is an L' -embedding $\psi : D \rightarrow F'$ so that $\psi \circ \tilde{\pi} = \tilde{\varphi}$ and hence $\psi \circ \pi = \varphi$. As $\psi \upharpoonright B_0$ is an L -embedding, this shows the extension property for F . So F is ultrahomogeneous, and $\text{Age}(F) = \mathbb{K}$ by (1) so $F \cong \text{Flim}(\mathbb{K})$, which completes the proof. $\square$

2.3. Strong Colorings.

Definition 2.8. [11] Write $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \chi)$ for the assertion: there is a coloring $c : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ so that for any $A \subseteq [\lambda]^{<\chi}$ of size μ consisting of pairwise disjoint subsets of λ and any color $\gamma < \theta$ there are $a, b \in A$ with $\max(a) < \min(b)$ with $c(\{\alpha, \beta\}) = \gamma$ for all $\alpha \in a, \beta \in b$.

Note, for example, that $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \lambda, 2, 2)$ holds if and only if $\lambda \not\rightarrow (\lambda)_2^2$ - i.e. λ is not weakly compact.

Observation 2.9. For fixed λ , if $\mu \leq \mu', \theta' \leq \theta, \chi' \leq \chi$, then

$$\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \chi) \implies \text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \mu', \theta', \chi').$$

Proof. Fix $c : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ witnessing $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \chi)$. Define a new coloring $c' : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow \theta'$ by $c'(\{\alpha, \beta\}) = c(\{\alpha, \beta\})$ if $c(\{\alpha, \beta\}) < \theta'$ and $c'(\{\alpha, \beta\}) = 0$ otherwise. Now suppose $A \subseteq [\lambda]^{<\chi'}$ is a family of pairwise disjoint sets with $|A| \geq \mu'$. Then, in particular, $A \subseteq [\lambda]^{<\chi}$ and $|A| \geq \mu$ so for any $\gamma < \theta'$, as $\gamma < \theta$, there are $a, b \in A$ with $\max(a) < \min(b)$ with $c'(\{\alpha, \beta\}) = c(\{\alpha, \beta\}) = \gamma$ for all $\alpha \in a, \beta \in b$, using $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \chi)$ and the definition of c' . This shows c' witnesses $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \mu', \theta', \chi')$. $\square$

Galvin proved Pr_1 holds in some form for arbitrary successor cardinals from instances of GCH. Considerably later, Shelah proved that Pr_1 holds in a strong form for the double-successors of arbitrary regular cardinals in ZFC.

Fact 2.10. [3] If λ is an infinite cardinal and $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$, then $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda^+, \lambda^+, \lambda^+, \aleph_0)$.

Fact 2.11. [12] The principle $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, \lambda)$ holds for every regular cardinal λ .

3. THE MAIN CONSTRUCTION

From strong colorings, we construct theories with $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) + \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T) < \kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T)$. For each regular uncountable cardinal κ and coloring $f : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow 2$ we build a theory $T_{\kappa, f}^*$ which comes equipped with a canonical cdt-pattern of height κ , in which the consistency of two incomparable nodes, one on level α and another on level β , is

determined by the value of the coloring $f(\{\alpha, \beta\})$. We then analyze the possible inp- and sct-patterns that arise in models of $T_{\kappa, f}^*$ and show that the existence of an inp- or sct-pattern of height κ implies certain homogeneity properties about the coloring f . If there is an inp-pattern of height κ , we can conclude that f has a homogeneous set of size κ . In the case that there is an sct-pattern of height κ , we cannot quite get a homogeneous set, but one nearly so: we prove in this case that there is a color $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$ and a collection $(v_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa)$ of pairwise disjoint finite subsets of κ so that given $\alpha < \alpha'$, there are $\xi \in v_\alpha, \zeta \in v_{\alpha'}$ so that $f(\{\xi, \zeta\}) = \gamma$. This is precisely the kind of homogeneity which a strong coloring witnessing $\text{Pr}_1(\kappa, \kappa, 2, \aleph_0)$ explicitly prohibits. The theory associated to such a coloring, then, gives the desired counterexample.

3.1. Building a Theory. Suppose κ is a regular uncountable cardinal. We define a language $L_\kappa = \langle O, P_\alpha, f_{\alpha\beta}, p_\alpha : \alpha \leq \beta < \kappa \rangle$, where O and all the P_α are unary predicates and the $f_{\alpha\beta}$ and p_α are unary functions. Given a subset $w \subseteq \kappa$, let $L_w = \langle O, P_\alpha, f_{\alpha\beta}, p_\alpha : \alpha \leq \beta, \alpha, \beta \in w \rangle$. Given a function $f : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow 2$, we define a universal theory $T_{\kappa, f}$ with the following axiom schemas:

- (1) O and the P_α are pairwise disjoint;
- (2) $f_{\alpha\alpha}$ is the identity function, for all $\alpha < \beta$,

$$(\forall x)[(x \notin P_\beta \rightarrow f_{\alpha\beta}(x) = x) \wedge (x \in P_\beta \rightarrow f_{\alpha\beta}(x) \in P_\alpha)],$$

and if $\alpha < \beta < \gamma$, then

$$(\forall x \in P_\gamma)[f_{\alpha\gamma}(x) = (f_{\alpha\beta} \circ f_{\beta\gamma})(x)].$$

- (3) For all $\alpha < \kappa$,

$$(\forall x)[(x \notin O \rightarrow p_\alpha(x) = x) \wedge (p_\alpha(x) \neq x \rightarrow p_\alpha(x) \in P_\alpha)].$$

- (4) If $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$ and $f(\{\alpha, \beta\}) = 0$, then we have the axiom $(\forall z \in O)[p_\alpha(z) \neq z \wedge p_\beta(z) \neq z \rightarrow p_\alpha(z) = (f_{\alpha\beta} \circ p_\beta)(z)]$.

The O is for “objects” and $\bigcup P_\alpha$ is a tree of “parameters” where each P_α names nodes of level α . The functions $f_{\alpha\beta}$ map elements of the tree at level β to their unique predecessor at level α . So the tree partial order is coded in a highly non-uniform way, for each pair of levels. The p_α ’s should be considered as partial functions on O which connect objects to elements of the tree. Axiom (4) says, in essence, that if $f(\{\alpha, \beta\}) = 0$, then the only way for an object to connect to a node on level α and a node on level β is if these two nodes lie along a path in the tree.

Lemma 3.1. *Define a class of finite structures*

$$\mathbb{K}_w = \{ \text{finite models of } T_{\kappa, f} \upharpoonright L_w \}.$$

Then for finite w , $\mathbb{K}_w$ is a Fraïssé class and, moreover, it is uniformly locally finite.

Proof. The axioms for $T_{\kappa, f}$ are universal so HP is clear. JEP and AP are proved similarly, so we will give the argument for AP only. Suppose A includes into B and C where $A, B, C \in \mathbb{K}_w$ and $B \cap C = A$. $B \cup C$ may be viewed as an L_w -structure by interpreting each predicate Q of L_w so that $Q^{B \cup C} = Q^B \cup Q^C$ and similarly interpreting $g^{B \cup C} = g^B \cup g^C$ for all the function symbols $g \in L_w$. It is easy to check that $B \cup C$ is a model of $T_{\kappa, f} \upharpoonright L_w$. To see uniform local finiteness, just observe that a set of size n can generate a model of size at most $(|w| + 1)n$ in virtue of the way that the functions are defined. $\square$

Hence, for each finite $w \subset \kappa$, there is a countable ultrahomogeneous L_w -structure M_w with $\text{Age}(M_w) = \mathbb{K}_w$. Let $T_w^* = \text{Th}(M_w)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose $w \subseteq v \subseteq \kappa$ and v, w are both finite. Then $T_w^* \subset T_v^*$.*

Proof. Suppose w is a finite subset of κ and $\gamma \in \kappa \setminus w$. By induction, it suffices to consider the case when $v = w \cup \{\gamma\}$. We will use Lemma 2.7. It is clear that if $D \in \mathbb{K}_w$ and A is an L_v -substructure of $D|_{L_v}$ then $A \in K_v$. For the other direction, suppose $A \in \mathbb{K}_v$ and we will construct $D \in \mathbb{K}_w$ so that A is an L_v -substructure of $D|_{L_v}$. If γ is the greatest element of w , let D be the L_w -structure expanding A with $P_\gamma^D = \emptyset$ and p_γ and each $f_{\beta\gamma}$ interpreted as the identity functions for all $\beta \in w$. It is easy to check that $D \in \mathbb{K}_w$. If γ is not the greatest element of v , let α^* be the least element of w greater than γ . Let D have underlying set $A \cup \{*_d : d \in P_{\alpha^*}^A\}$, where the $*_d$ denote new formal elements. Interpret the predicates of L_w on D so that $P_\gamma^D = \{*_d : d \in P_{\alpha^*}^A\}$, $O^D = O^A$ and $P_\beta^D = P_\beta^A$ for all $\beta \in v$. If $\beta \leq \delta$ are in v , interpret $f_{\beta\delta}^D|_{P_\delta^D} = f_{\beta\delta}^A|_{P_\delta^A}$ and to be the identity function elsewhere. If $\beta \in v$ and $\beta > \gamma$ and $c \in P_\beta^D$, define $f_{\gamma\beta}^D(c) = *_d$ and to be the identity elsewhere. If $\beta \in v$ and $\beta < \gamma$ then define $f_{\beta\gamma}^D$ to be the identity outside of P_γ^D and so, on P_γ^D , $f_{\beta\gamma}(*_d) = f_{\beta\alpha^*}(d)$. Finally, interpret $f_{\gamma\gamma}^D$ to be the identity function. It is clear from the construction that A is an L_v -substructure of $D|_{L_v}$ and easy to check that $D \in \mathbb{K}_w$. This shows that the condition of Lemma 2.7(1) is satisfied.

To verify the condition of Lemma 2.7(2), must show that if $A, B \in \mathbb{K}_w$, $\pi : A \rightarrow B$ is an L_w -embedding, and $C \in \mathbb{K}_v$ with $C = \langle A \rangle_{L_v}^C$, then there is some $D \in \mathbb{K}_v$ with $\langle B \rangle_{L_v}^D = D$ and an L_v -embedding $\tilde{\pi} : C \rightarrow D$ extending π .

Let A, B, π and C as above be given, and we will construct D . We may assume that $C \cap B = \emptyset$. The requirement that $C = \langle A \rangle_{L_v}^C$ implies that the only elements of the underlying set of C that are not already in A appear in $P_\gamma(C)$. As a set, define D to be the set

$$D = B \cup P_\gamma(C) \cup \{*_d : d \in P_{\alpha^*}(B) \setminus \pi(P_{\alpha^*}(C))\}$$

where α^* is the least element of w greater than γ (and if there is no such, then let $D = B \cup P_\gamma(C)$) and, as above, the $*_d$ denote new formal elements. Let $\tilde{\pi}$ be the map extending π which is the identity on $P_\gamma(C)$.

Let $P_\gamma^D = P_\gamma(C) \cup \{*_d : d \in P_{\alpha^*}(B) \setminus \pi(P_{\alpha^*}(C))\}$ and interpret all other unary predicates on D to coincide with their interpretation on B . Define the interpretations of the functions on D as follows: for any pair $\alpha, \beta \in w$ with $\alpha \leq \beta$, and $b \in B$ let $f_{\alpha\beta}^D(b) = f_{\alpha\beta}^B(b)$. Interpret $f_{\gamma\alpha^*}^D$ on $P_\gamma(D)$ so that $c \in P_\gamma(C)$ then $f_{\gamma\alpha^*}^D(\pi(c)) = f_{\gamma\alpha^*}^C(c) = \tilde{\pi}(f_{\gamma\alpha^*}^C(c))$ and so that $f_{\gamma\alpha^*}(d) = *_d$. Then let $f_{\gamma\alpha^*}^D$ be the identity outside of $P_{\alpha^*}(D)$. Now the interpretations of the others are forced: if $\alpha \geq \alpha^*$ and $\beta \leq \beta^*$, define $f_{\gamma\alpha}^D$ so that $f_{\gamma\alpha}^D = f_{\gamma\alpha^*}^B \circ f_{\alpha^*\alpha}^D$ and $f_{\beta\gamma}^D = f_{\beta\beta^*}^B \circ f_{\beta^*\gamma}^D$. Finally, interpret $p_\alpha^D = p_\alpha^B$ for $\alpha \in w$ and let p_γ^D be interpreted so that

$$p_\gamma^D(d) = \begin{cases} p_\gamma^C(c) = \tilde{\pi}(p_\gamma^C(c)) & \text{if } d = \pi(c), c \in O^C \\ d & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By construction $p_\gamma^D(x) = x$ for all x outside of $O(D)$ and $p_\gamma^D(x) \neq x$ implies $p_\gamma^D(x) = p_\gamma^C(y) \in P_\gamma(C) = P_\gamma(D)$ for some $y \in C$ with $\pi(c) = x$, so D satisfies axiom (3). It is clear that $\tilde{\pi} : C \rightarrow D$ is a function which extends π and, moreover, it preserves all L_v -structure so $\tilde{\pi}$ is an L_v -embedding. Finally, we check axiom (4). Suppose there are $\alpha < \beta$ with $\alpha, \beta \in v$ and $f(\{\alpha, \beta\}) = 0$, together with $d \in O(D)$,

$g \in P_\alpha(D)$, $h \in P_\beta(D)$ so that $p_\alpha(d) = g$ and $p_\beta(d) = h$. We must show that $f_{\alpha\beta}(h) = g$. If $\alpha, \beta \in w$, then this is immediate, as axiom (4) is satisfied in B . So consider the case that $\beta = \gamma$. Now $p_\gamma(d) = h \neq d$ implies, by construction, that there is some $c \in C$ so that $d = \pi(c)$. As $p_\alpha(d) \in P_\alpha(D)$ and $p_\beta(d) \in P_\beta(D)$, it follows that $p_\alpha(c) \in P_\alpha(C)$ and $p_\beta(c) \in P_\beta(C)$. As axiom (4) is satisfied in C , we know that $(f_{\alpha\beta} \circ p_\beta)(c) = p_\alpha(c)$. It follows that $(f_{\alpha\beta} \circ p_\beta)(d) = p_\alpha(d)$ in D , which shows $f_{\alpha\beta}(h) = g$ in D . The case that $\alpha = \gamma$ is entirely similar, so axiom (4) is satisfied in D . $\square$

Lemma 3.2 shows that we may construct a complete L_κ -theory as a union of the theories of the Fraïssé limits of the $\mathbb{K}_w$ for $w \subset \kappa$ finite. Define the theory $T_{\kappa,f}^*$ as the union of the T_w^* for all finite $w \subset \kappa$. Because each T_w^* is complete and eliminates quantifiers, it follows that $T_{\kappa,f}^*$ is a complete theory extending $T_{\kappa,f}$ which eliminates quantifiers.

4. ANALYSIS OF THE INVARIANTS

For this section, we will fix κ a regular uncountable cardinal, a coloring $f : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow 2$, and a monster model $\mathbb{M} \models T_{\kappa,f}^*$.

4.1. Rectification and other preparatory lemmas.

Definition 4.1. Given $X \in \{\text{inp}, \text{sct}\}$, we say an X -pattern $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$ of height κ is *rectified* if the following conditions hold:

- (1) There is a Δ -system of sets $(w_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa)$ with root r so that each w_α is a finite subset of κ , each $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha)$ is contained in the language L_{w_α} , and for all $\alpha < \kappa$, $\max r < \min(w_\alpha \setminus r)$ and if $\alpha < \alpha'$, $\max(w_\alpha \setminus r) < \min(w_{\alpha'} \setminus r)$. Moreover, each w_α has the same cardinality.
- (2) The witnessing parameters are indiscernible in the relevant sense (s -indiscernible in the case that $X = \text{sct}$, mutually indiscernible in the case of $x = \text{inp}$).
- (3) $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha)$ isolates the L_{w_α} -type of x over y_α .
- (4) The tuples in the witnessing parameters are closed under the functions in the language corresponding to their level: if $X = \text{inp}$ and $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$ is an inp-pattern witnessed by the mutually indiscernible array $(a_{\alpha,i})_{\alpha < \kappa, i < \omega}$ then for all $\alpha < \kappa$ and $i < \omega$, $a_{\alpha,i}$ is closed under the functions of L_{w_α} . Similarly, if $X = \text{sct}$ and $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$ is an sct-pattern witnessed by $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}}$, then for all $\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}$, the tuple a_η is closed under the functions of $L_{w_{l(\eta)}}$.

By the *associated Δ -system* of a rectified X -pattern, we mean the Δ -system $(w_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa)$ so that $\varphi_\alpha \in L_{w_\alpha}$. We will consistently denote the root $r = \{\alpha_i : i < n\}$ and the sets $v_\alpha = w_\alpha \setminus r = \{\beta_{\alpha,i} : i < m\}$ where the enumerations are increasing.

Lemma 4.2. *Given $X \in \{\text{inp}, \text{sct}\}$, if there is an X -pattern of height κ in T , there is a rectified one.*

Proof. Given an X -pattern $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$ one can choose some finite $w_\alpha \subset \kappa$ so that $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha)$ is in L_{w_α} . Apply the Δ -system lemma to the collection $(w_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa)$ to find some $I \subseteq \kappa$ so that $(w_\alpha : \alpha \in I)$ forms a Δ -system with root r . By pigeonhole and the regularity of κ , we may assume $|w_\alpha| = m$ for all α , for all $\alpha < \kappa$ $\max r < \min(w_\alpha \setminus r)$, and if $\alpha < \alpha'$, $\max(w_\alpha \setminus r) < \min(w_{\alpha'} \setminus r)$. By renaming, we may assume $I = \kappa$.

If $X = \text{inp}$, we may take the parameters witnessing that $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$ to be a mutually indiscernible array $(a_{\alpha,i})_{\alpha < \kappa, i < \omega}$ by Fact 2.5(1). Moreover, mutual indiscernibility is clearly preserved after replacing each $a_{\alpha,i}$ by its closure under the functions of L_{w_α} and by $\aleph_0$ -categoricity of $T_{w_\alpha}^*$ this stays finite. Let $b \models \{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,0}) : \alpha < \kappa\}$. Using again the $\aleph_0$ -categoricity of $T_{w_\alpha}^*$, replace $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha)$ by a complete L_{w_α} -formula $\varphi'_\alpha(x; y_\alpha)$ so that $\varphi'_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,0})$ isolates the type $\text{tp}_{L_{w_\alpha}}(b/a_{\alpha,0})$. By mutual indiscernibility, if $f : \kappa \rightarrow \omega$ is a function, there is $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M})$ so that $\sigma(a_{\alpha,0}) = a_{\alpha,f(\alpha)}$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$. Then $\sigma(b) \models \{\varphi'_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,f(\alpha)}) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ so paths are consistent. The row-wise inconsistency is clear so $(\varphi'_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$ forms an inp-pattern.

If $X = \text{sct}$, we may take the parameters witnessing that $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$ is an sct-pattern to be s -indiscernible, by Fact 2.5(2). s -indiscernibility is preserved by replacing each a_η by its closure under the functions of $L_{w_{l(\eta)}}$ and this closure is finite. Let $b \models \{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{0^\alpha}) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ and replace φ_α by $\varphi'_\alpha(x; y_\alpha)$, a complete L_{w_α} -formula isolating $\text{tp}_{L_{w_\alpha}}(b/a_{0^\alpha})$. For all $\eta \in \omega^\kappa$, there is a $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{M})$ so that $\sigma(a_{0^\alpha}) = a_{\eta|_\alpha}$. Then $\sigma(b) \models \{\varphi'_\alpha(x; a_{\eta|_\alpha}) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ so paths are consistent. Incomparable nodes remain inconsistent, so $(\varphi'_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$ forms an sct-pattern. $\square$

4.2. Computing κ_{cdt} .

Proposition 4.3. $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T_{\kappa,f}^*) = \kappa^+$.

Proof. First, we will show $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T_{\kappa,f}^*) \geq \kappa^+$. We will construct a cdt-pattern of height κ . By recursion on $\alpha < \kappa$, we will construct a tree of tuples $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \omega^{<\kappa}}$ so that $l(\eta) = \beta$ implies $a_\eta \in P_\beta$ and if $\eta \trianglelefteq \nu$ with $l(\eta) = \beta$ and $l(\nu) = \gamma$, then $f_{\beta\gamma}(a_\nu) = a_\eta$. For $\alpha = 0$, choose an arbitrary $a \in P_0$ and let $a_\emptyset = a$. Now suppose given $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \omega^{\leq \alpha}}$. For each $\eta \in \omega^\alpha$, choose an infinite set $\{b_i : i < \omega\} \subseteq f_{\alpha\alpha+1}^{-1}(a_\eta)$. Define $a_{\eta \smallfrown \langle i \rangle} = b_i$. This gives us $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \omega^{\leq \alpha+1}}$ with the desired properties. Now suppose δ is a limit and we've defined $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \omega^{\leq \alpha}}$ for all $\alpha < \delta$. Given any $\eta \in \omega^\delta$, we may, by saturation, find an element $b \in \bigcap_{\alpha < \delta} f_{\alpha\delta}^{-1}(a_{\eta|_\alpha})$. Then we can set $a_\eta = b$. This gives $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \omega^{\leq \delta}}$ and completes the construction.

Given $\alpha < \kappa$, let $\varphi_\alpha(x; y)$ be the formula $p_\alpha(x) = y$. For any $\eta \in \omega^\kappa$, $\{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\eta|_\alpha}) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is consistent and, for all $\nu \in \omega^{<\kappa}$, $\{\varphi_{l(\nu)+1}(x; a_{\nu \smallfrown \langle i \rangle}) : i < \omega\}$ is 2-inconsistent. We have thus exhibited a cdt-pattern of height κ so $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T_{\kappa,f}^*) \geq \kappa^+$.

Using quantifier-elimination, it is easy to check that each theory T_w^* is stable (in fact, ω -stable) for any finite $w \subset \kappa$. Hence $T_{\kappa,f}^*$ is stable and therefore $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T_{\kappa,f}^*) \leq |T_{\kappa,f}^*|^+ = \kappa^+$. This yields the desired equality. $\square$

4.3. Case 1: $\kappa_{\text{inp}} = \kappa^+$.

Lemma 4.4. Fix a collection of ordinals $< \kappa$ $(\beta_{\alpha,i})_{\alpha < \kappa, i < 2}$ so that if $\alpha < \alpha' < \kappa$, then $\beta_{\alpha,0} \leq \beta_{\alpha',0}$, $\beta_{\alpha',0} \leq \beta_{\alpha',1}$, $\beta_{\alpha,0} \leq \beta_{\alpha',0}$ and $\beta_{\alpha,1} < \beta_{\alpha',1}$. Suppose that there is a mutually indiscernible array $(c_{\alpha,k})_{\alpha < \kappa, k < \omega}$ so that, with $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha)$ defined by $(f_{\beta_{\alpha,0}\beta_{\alpha,1}} \circ p_{\beta_{\alpha,1}})(x) = y_\alpha$, $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$, $(c_{\alpha,k})_{\alpha < \kappa, k < \omega}$ forms an inp-pattern of height κ . Then for all $\alpha < \alpha'$, $f(\{\beta_{\alpha,1}, \beta_{\alpha',1}\}) = 1$.

Proof. If $\alpha < \alpha'$ and $f(\{\beta_{\alpha,1}, \beta_{\alpha',1}\}) = 0$, then $p_{\beta_{\alpha,1}}(x) = (f_{\beta_{\alpha,1}\beta_{\alpha',1}} \circ p_{\beta_{\alpha',1}})(x)$ for any x with $p_{\beta_{\alpha,1}}(x) \neq x$ and $p_{\beta_{\alpha',1}}(x) \neq x$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} (f_{\beta_{\alpha,0}\beta_{\alpha,1}} \circ p_{\beta_{\alpha,1}})(x) &= (f_{\beta_{\alpha,0}\beta_{\alpha,1}} \circ f_{\beta_{\alpha,1}\beta_{\alpha',1}} \circ p_{\beta_{\alpha',1}})(x) \\ &= (f_{\beta_{\alpha,0}\beta_{\alpha',1}} \circ p_{\beta_{\alpha',1}})(x) \\ &= (f_{\beta_{\alpha,0},\beta_{\alpha',0}} \circ f_{\beta_{\alpha',0}\beta_{\alpha',1}} \circ p_{\beta_{\alpha',1}})(x), \end{aligned}$$

for any x with $p_{\beta_{\alpha,1}}(x) \neq x$ and $p_{\beta_{\alpha',1}}(x) \neq x$. Consequently,

$$\{(f_{\beta_{\alpha,0}\beta_{\alpha,1}} \circ p_{\beta_{\alpha,1}})(x) = c_{\alpha,k}, (f_{\beta_{\alpha',0}\beta_{\alpha',1}} \circ p_{\beta_{\alpha',1}})(x) = c_{\alpha',k'}\}$$

is consistent only if $c_{\alpha,k} = f_{\beta_{\alpha,0}\beta_{\alpha',0}}(c_{\alpha',k'})$, which contradicts the definition of inp-pattern. $\square$

For the remainder of this subsection, we fix a rectified inp-pattern $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$, $(a_{\alpha,i})_{\alpha < \kappa, i < \omega}$ and, by [1, Corollary 2.9], we may assume $l(x) = 1$. The associated Δ -system is denoted $(w_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa)$ with root $r = \{\alpha_i : i < n\}$ and $w_\alpha \setminus r = v_\alpha = \{\beta_{\alpha,j} : j < m\}$.

Lemma 4.5. *For all $\alpha < \kappa$, $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) \vdash x \in O$.*

Proof. First, note that we may assume that there is a predicate $Q \in \{O, P_{\alpha_i} : i < n\}$ so that $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) \vdash x \in Q$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$ – if not, using that the w_α 's form a Δ -system, there would be some $\alpha < \kappa$ so that $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha)$ implies that x is not contained in any predicate of L_{w_α} in which case it is easy to check that $\{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,i}) : i < \omega\}$ is consistent, contradicting the definition of inp-pattern. So we must show that $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) \vdash P_{\alpha_i}$ for some $i < n$ is impossible. Write each tuple in the array $a_{\alpha,i}$ as $a_{\alpha,i} = (b_{\alpha,i}, c_{\alpha,i}, d_{\alpha,i}, e_{\alpha,i})$ where the elements of $b_{\alpha,i}$ are in O , the elements of $c_{\alpha,i}$ are in predicates indexed by the root $\bigcup_{i < n} P_{\alpha_i}$, the elements of $d_{\alpha,i}$ are in predicates outside the root $\bigcup_{j < m} P_{\beta_{\alpha,j}}$, and the elements of $e_{\alpha,i}$ are in any predicate of L_{w_α} . By quantifier-elimination, each $\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,i})$ may be expressed as a conjunction of

- (1) $x \in P_{\alpha_i}$
- (2) $x \neq (a_{\alpha,i})_l$ for all $l < l(a_{\alpha,i})$
- (3) $(f_{\gamma\alpha_i}(x) = (c)_l)^{t_{\gamma,l}}$ for all $l < l(c_{\alpha,i})$ and $\gamma \in w_\alpha$ less than α_i and some $t_{\gamma,l} \in \{0, 1\}$.

For each $k < i$, let γ_k be the least ordinal $< \kappa$ so that $\varphi_{\gamma_k}(x; a_{\gamma_k,0}) \vdash f_{\alpha_k\alpha_i}(x) = c$ for some $c \in c_{\gamma_k,0}$ and 0 if there is no such. Let $\gamma = \max\{\gamma_k : k < i\}$. We claim that $\{\varphi_{\gamma+1}(x; a_{\gamma+1,j}) : j < \omega\}$ is consistent. For all $j < \omega$,

$$\{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,0}) : \alpha \leq \gamma\} \cup \{\varphi_{\gamma+1}(x; a_{\gamma+1,j})\}$$

is consistent so any equality of the form $f_{\alpha_k\alpha_i}(x) = c$ implied by $\varphi_{\gamma+1}(x; a_{\gamma+1,j})$ is already implied by $\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,0})$ by our choice of γ and any inequality of the form $f_{\alpha_k\alpha_i}(x) \neq c$ implied by $\varphi_{\gamma+1}(x; a_{\gamma+1,j})$ is compatible with $\{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,0}) : \alpha \leq \gamma\}$. Choosing a realization $b \models \{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,0}) : \alpha \leq \gamma\}$ satisfying every inequality of the form $f_{\alpha_k\alpha_i}(x) \neq c$ implied by the $\varphi_{\gamma+1}(x; a_{\gamma+1,j})$ yields a realization of $\{\varphi_{\gamma+1}(x; a_{\gamma+1,j}) : j < \omega\}$. This contradicts the definition of inp-pattern. $\square$

Proposition 4.6. *There is a subset $H \subseteq \kappa$ with $|H| = \kappa$ so that f is constant on $[H]^2$.*

Proof. By quantifier elimination and Lemma 4.5, for each $\alpha < \kappa$, $\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,0})$ is a conjunction of the following:

- (1) $x \in O$
- (2) $x \neq (a)_l$ for all $l < l(a)$
- (3) $(p_\gamma(x) = x)^t$.
- (4) The values of the p_γ and how they descend in the tree:
 - (a) $((f_{\delta\gamma} \circ p_\gamma)(x) = (a_{0,\alpha})_l)^t$ for $l < l(a_{0,\alpha})$, $\delta \leq \gamma$ in w_α .
 - (b) $((f_{\delta\gamma} \circ p_\gamma)(x) = (f_{\delta\gamma'} \circ p_{\gamma'})(x))^t$ for $\delta, \gamma, \gamma' \in w_\alpha$ with $\delta \leq \gamma < \gamma'$.

Let $\gamma < \kappa$ be some ordinal so that for any $\alpha < \kappa$ if there is a $c \in a_{\alpha,0}$ so that $\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,0}) \vdash (f_{\alpha_i\alpha_{i'}} \circ p_{\alpha_{i'}})(x) = c$ for some $i \leq i' < n$, then there is some $\alpha' < \gamma$ so that $\varphi_{\alpha'}(x; a_{\alpha',0}) \vdash (f_{\alpha_i\alpha_{i'}} \circ p_{\alpha_{i'}})(x) = c$. As the root $r = \{\alpha_i : i < n\}$ is finite and the all 0's path is consistent, such a γ must exist.

Claim: Given $\alpha < \kappa$, there are $\epsilon_\alpha \leq \epsilon'_\alpha \in w_\alpha$ and pairwise distinct $c_{\alpha,k} \in a_{\alpha,k}$ so that $\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,k}) \vdash (f_{\epsilon_\alpha\epsilon'_\alpha} \circ p_{\epsilon'_\alpha})(x) = c_{\alpha,k}$.

Proof of claim: Suppose not. Then, by the description of $\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,k})$ given above, the partial type

$$\{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,k}) : k < \omega\}$$

is equivalent to a finite number of equations common to each instance $\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,k})$ and an infinite collection of inequations. Then, it is easy to see then that $\{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,k}) : k < \omega\}$ is consistent, contradicting the definition of an inp-pattern. This proves the claim.

Note that, by the pigeonhole principle, we may assume that either (i) $\epsilon_\alpha, \epsilon'_\alpha \in r$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$, (ii) $\epsilon_\alpha \in r, \epsilon'_\alpha \in v_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$, or (iii) $\epsilon_\alpha, \epsilon'_\alpha \in v_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$. Case (i) is impossible by the choice of γ and, again by the pigeonhole principle, we may assume that if we are in case (ii), that ϵ_α is constant for all α . Then by rectification, we know that when $\alpha < \alpha'$, $\epsilon_\alpha \leq \epsilon_{\alpha'}$ and $\epsilon'_\alpha < \epsilon'_{\alpha'}$. Because for all $\alpha < \kappa$, the $c_{\alpha,k}$ are pairwise distinct and k varies, the set of formulas

$$\{(f_{\epsilon_\alpha\epsilon'_\alpha} \circ p_{\epsilon'_\alpha})(x) = c_{\alpha,k} : k < \omega\}$$

is 2-inconsistent. Moreover, if $g : \kappa \rightarrow \omega$ is a function, the partial type

$$\{(f_{\epsilon_\alpha\epsilon'_{g(\alpha)}} \circ p_{\epsilon'_{g(\alpha)}})(x) = c_{\alpha,g(\alpha)} : \alpha < \kappa\}$$

is implied by $\{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\alpha,g(\alpha)}) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ and is therefore consistent. It follows that $((f_{\epsilon_\alpha\epsilon'_\alpha} \circ p_{\epsilon'_\alpha})(x) = y_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}, (c_{\alpha,k})_{\alpha < \kappa, k < \omega}$ is an inp-pattern. By Lemma 4.4, $f(\{\epsilon'_\alpha, \epsilon'_{\alpha'}\}) = 1$ for all $\alpha < \alpha'$. Therefore $H = \{\epsilon'_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is a homogeneous set for f . $\square$

4.4. Case 2: $\kappa_{\text{sct}} = \kappa^+$. In this subsection, we show that if $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T_{\kappa,f}^*) = \kappa^+$ then f satisfies a homogeneity property inconsistent with f being a strong coloring. In particular, we will show that if this homogeneity property fails, then for any putative sct-pattern of height κ , there are two incomparable elements in $\omega^{<\kappa}$ which index compatible formulas, contradicting the inconsistency condition in the definition of an sct-pattern. This step is accomplished by relating consistency of the relevant formulas to an amalgamation problem in finite structures. The following lemma describes the relevant amalgamation problem:

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose given:*

- Finite sets $w, w' \subset \kappa$ with $w \cap w' = v$ so that for all $\alpha \in v, \beta \in w \setminus v, \gamma \in w' \setminus v$, we have $\alpha < \beta < \gamma$ and $f(\{\beta, \gamma\}) = 1$.
- Structures $A \in \mathbb{K}_{w \cup w'}, B = \langle d, A \rangle_{L_w} \in \mathbb{K}_w, C = \langle e, A \rangle_{L_{w'}} \in \mathbb{K}_{w'}$ so that the map sending $d \mapsto e$ induces an isomorphism of L_v -structures over A between $\langle d, A \rangle_{L_v}$ and $\langle e, A \rangle_{L_v}$.

Then there is $D = \langle f, A \rangle_{L_{w \cup w'}}^D \in \mathbb{K}_{w \cup w'}$ extending A so that $l(f) = l(d) = l(e)$ and $\langle f, A \rangle_{L_w}^D \cong B$ over A and $\langle f, A \rangle_{L_{w'}}^D \cong C$ over A via the isomorphisms over A sending $f \mapsto d$ and $f \mapsto e$, respectively.

Proof. Let f be a tuple of formal elements with $l(f) = l(d) (= l(e))$ with L_w and $L_{w'}$ interpreted so that $\langle f, A \rangle_{L_w}$ extends A and is isomorphic over A to B , and so that $\langle f, A \rangle_{L_{w'}}$ extends A and is isomorphic over A to C . Let D have underlying set

$$\langle f, A \rangle_{L_w} \cup \langle f, A \rangle_{L_{w'}} \cup \{ *_{\alpha, c} : \alpha \in w \setminus v, c \in P_\gamma(\langle f, A \rangle_{L_{w'}}) \setminus P_\gamma(A) \},$$

where γ is the least element of $w' \setminus v$. We must give D an $L_{w \cup w'}$ -structure. Let the elements of A , $\langle f, A \rangle_{L_w}$, $\langle f, A \rangle_{L_{w'}}$ in D inherit the interpretations from these respective structures. Interpret the predicates on the new formal elements $*_{\alpha, c}$ by ensuring $P_\alpha(*_{\alpha, c})$ holds and no other predicates hold on this element for all $\alpha \in w$ and $c \in P_\gamma(\langle f, A \rangle_{L_{w'}}) \setminus P_\gamma(A)$. Given $\alpha \in w \setminus v$ and $c \in P_\gamma(\langle f, A \rangle_{L_{w'}}) \setminus P_\gamma(A)$, interpret $f_{\alpha\gamma}^D(c) = *_{\alpha, c}$ and for any $\beta \in w' \setminus v$, define $f_{\alpha\beta}^D = f_{\alpha\gamma}^D \circ f_{\gamma\beta}^D$ on P_β^D and the identity on $D \setminus P_\beta^D$. If $\alpha \in w \setminus v$ and $\xi \in v$, interpret $f_{\xi\alpha}^D$ so that $f_{\xi\alpha}^D(*_{\alpha, c}) = f_{\xi\gamma}^D(c)$. Finally, interpret each function of the form p_β for $\beta \in w \cup w'$ to be the identity on the $*_{\alpha, c}$. This completes the definition of the $L_{w \cup w'}$ -structure on D .

Now we must check that $D \in \mathbb{K}_{w \cup w'}$. It is easy to check that axioms (1) – (3) are satisfied in D . As $f(\{\alpha, \beta\}) = 1$ for all $\alpha \in w \setminus v, \beta \in w' \setminus v$, the only possible counterexample to axiom (4) can occur when $\xi \in v, \beta \in (w \cup w') \setminus v$ and $f(\{\xi, \beta\}) = 0$. As the formal elements $*_{\alpha, c}$ are not in the image of O under the p_α , it follows that a counterexample to axiom (4) must come from a counterexample either in B or C , which is impossible. So $D \in \mathbb{K}_{w \cup w'}$, which completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$, $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \omega < \kappa}$ is a rectified sct-pattern such that $l(x)$ is minimal among sct-patterns of height κ . Then for all $\alpha < \kappa$, $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) \vdash (x)_l \in O \cup \bigcup_{i < n} P_{\alpha_i}$ for all $l < l(x)$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that if, for some $l < l(x)$ and all $\alpha < \kappa$, $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) \vdash (x)_l \notin O \cup \bigcup_{i < n} P_{\alpha_i} \cup \bigcup_{j < m} P_{\beta_{\alpha, j}}$, then the only relations that $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha)$ can assert between $(x)_l$ and the elements of y_α and the other elements of x are equalities and inequalities allowing us to find an sct-pattern in fewer variables, contradicting minimality (or if $l(x) = 1$ a contradiction). So there is some $\alpha < \kappa$ and $j < m$ so that $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) \vdash (x)_l \in P_{\beta_{\alpha, j}}$ and therefore, for all $\alpha' \neq \alpha$, $\varphi_{\alpha'}(x; y_{\alpha'})$ implies that $(x)_l$ is not in any of the unary predicates of $L_{w_{\alpha'}}$, as $\beta_{\alpha, j}$ is outside the root of the Δ -system. So $(\varphi_{\alpha'}(x; y_{\alpha'}) : \alpha' < \kappa, \alpha' \neq \alpha)$ forms an sct-pattern which falls into the first case considered, a contradiction. $\square$

Proposition 4.9. *Suppose $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa)$ is a rectified sct-pattern such that $l(x)$ is minimal among sct-patterns of height κ and whose associated Δ -system is $(w_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa)$, with $v_\alpha = w_\alpha \setminus r$, where r is the root. Then there is γ so that for any α, α' with $\gamma < \alpha < \alpha' < \kappa$ there is $\xi \in v_\alpha, \zeta \in v_{\alpha'}$ so that $f(\{\xi, \zeta\}) = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose not. By Lemma 4.8, we know that up to a relabeling of the variables, there is a $k \leq l(x)$ so that $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) \vdash (x)_l \in \bigcup_{i < n} P_{\alpha_i}$ for $l < k$ and $\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) \vdash (x)_l \in O$ for $l \geq k$. Choose $\gamma < \kappa$ so that if $\delta < \kappa$ and $\varphi_\delta(x; a_{0^\delta}) \vdash f_{\alpha_i \alpha_{i'}}((x)_l) = c$ for $l < k$, or $\varphi_\delta(x; a_{0^\delta}) \vdash p_{\alpha_i}((x)_l) = c$ or $\varphi_\delta(x; a_{0^\delta}) \vdash (f_{\alpha_i \alpha_{i'}} \circ p_{\alpha_{i'}})((x)_l) = c$ for $l \geq k$, for some c , then this is implied by $\varphi_{\delta'}(x; 0^{\delta'})$ for some $\delta' < \gamma$ (possible as the root is finite). By assumption, there are α, α' with

$\gamma < \alpha < \alpha' < \kappa$ so that $f(\{\xi, \zeta\}) = 1$ for all $\xi \in v_\alpha, \zeta \in v_{\alpha'}$. Choose $\eta \in \omega^\alpha$, $\nu \in \omega^{\alpha'}$ so that $\eta \perp \nu$. Let $A = \langle a_\eta, a_\nu \rangle_{L_{w_\alpha \cup w_{\alpha'}}}$ be the finite $L_{w_\alpha \cup w_{\alpha'}}$ -structure generated by a_η and a_ν . By assumption and quantifier-elimination, it is possible to choose d with $\varphi_\alpha(d; a_\eta)$ and e with $\varphi_{\alpha'}(e; a_\nu)$ so that $\text{tp}_{L_r}(d/A) = \text{tp}_{L_r}(e/A)$. Let $B = \langle d, A \rangle_{L_{w_\alpha}}$ and $C = \langle e, A \rangle_{L_{w_{\alpha'}}}$. By Lemma 4.7, there is a $D \in \mathbb{K}_{w_\alpha \cup w_{\alpha'}}$ so that $D = \langle g, A \rangle_{L_{w_\alpha \cup w_{\alpha'}}}^D$ so that $l(g) = l(d) = l(e)$ and $\langle g, A \rangle_{L_{w_\alpha}} \cong B$ over A and $\langle g, A \rangle_{L_{w_{\alpha'}}} \cong C$ over A . It follows by model-completeness that in $\mathbb{M}$, $g \models \{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_\eta), \varphi_{\alpha'}(x; a_\nu)\}$, contradicting the definition of sct-pattern. This completes the proof. $\square$

4.5. Conclusion.

Theorem 4.10. *There is a theory T so that $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) \neq \kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) + \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T)$. Moreover, it is consistent with ZFC that for every regular uncountable κ , there is a theory T with $|T| = \kappa$ and $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) \neq \kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) + \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T)$.*

Proof. If κ is regular and uncountable satisfying $\text{Pr}_1(\kappa, \kappa, 2, \aleph_0)$, then choose $f : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow 2$ witnessing $\text{Pr}_1(\kappa, \kappa, 2, \aleph_0)$. There can be no homogeneous set of size κ for f , using Observation 2.9, and, moreover, there can be no collection $(v_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa)$ of disjoint finite sets so that, given $\alpha < \alpha' < \kappa$, there are $\xi \in v_\alpha, \zeta \in v_{\alpha'}$ so that $f(\{\xi, \zeta\}) = 0$. Let $T = T_{\kappa, f}^*$. Then $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) = \kappa^+$, by Proposition 4.3, but $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) < \kappa^+$ and $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T) < \kappa^+$ by Proposition 4.9 and Proposition 4.6 respectively. By Fact 2.11 and Observation 2.9, $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, 2, \aleph_0)$ holds for any regular uncountable λ . Then $T = T_{\kappa, f}^*$ gives the desired theory, for $\kappa = \lambda^{++}$ and any f witnessing $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, 2, \aleph_0)$. For the “moreover” clause, note that ZFC is equiconsistent with ZFC + GCH + “there are no inaccessible cardinals” which entails that every regular uncountable cardinal is a successor. By Fact 2.10 this implies that $\text{Pr}_1(\kappa, \kappa, 2, \aleph_0)$ holds for all regular uncountable cardinals κ , which completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 4.11. In [2], it was proved that $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) = \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T) + \kappa_{\text{sct}}(T)$ for any countable theory T . The above theorem shows that in a certain sense, this result is best possible.

5. COMPACTNESS OF ULTRAPOWERS

We say an ultrafilter $\mathcal{D}$ on I is *regular* if there is a collection of sets $\{X_\alpha : \alpha < |I|\} \subset \mathcal{D}$ such that for all $t \in I$, the set $\{\alpha : t \in X_\alpha\}$ is finite and $\mathcal{D}$ is *uniform* if all sets in $\mathcal{D}$ have cardinality $|I|$. In this section we study the decay of saturation in regular ultrapowers. Given a theory T , we start with a regular uniform ultrafilter $\mathcal{D}$ on λ and a λ^{++} -saturated model $M \models T$. We then consider whether the ultrapower $M^\lambda/\mathcal{D}$ is λ^{++} -compact. Shelah has shown [10, VI.4.7] that if T is not simple, then in this situation $M^\lambda/\mathcal{D}$ will not be λ^{++} -compact and asked whether an analogous result holds for theories T with $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T) > \lambda^+$. We will show by direct construction that $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T) > \lambda^+$ does not suffice but, by modifying an argument due to Malliaris and Shelah [8, Claim 7.5], $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) > \lambda^+$ is sufficient to obtain a decay in compactness, by leveraging the finite square principles of Kennedy and Shelah [6].

5.1. A counterexample. Fix κ a regular uncountable cardinal. Let $L'_\kappa = \langle O, P_\alpha, p_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ be a language where O and each P_α is a unary predicate and each p_α is a unary function. Define a theory T'_κ to be the universal theory with the following axioms:

- (1) O and the P_α are pairwise disjoint.
- (2) p_α is a function so that $(\forall x \in O)[p_\alpha(x) \in P_\alpha]$ and $(\forall x \notin O)[p_\alpha(x) = x]$.

Given a finite set $w \subset \kappa$, define $L'_w = \langle O, P_\alpha, p_\alpha : \alpha \in w \rangle$. Let $\mathbb{K}'_w$ denote the class of finite models of $T'_\kappa \upharpoonright L'_w$.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose $w \subset \kappa$ is finite. Then $\mathbb{K}'_w$ is a Fraïssé class*

Proof. The axioms of $T'_\kappa \upharpoonright L'_w$ are universal so HP is clear. As we allow the empty structure to be a model, JEP follows from AP. For AP, we reduce to the case where $A, B, C \in \mathbb{K}'_w$, A is a substructure of both B and C and $B \cap C = A$. Define an L'_w -structure D on $B \cup C$ by taking unions of the relations and functions as interpreted on B and C . It is easy to see that $D \in \mathbb{K}'_w$, so we're done. $\square$

By Fraïssé theory, for each finite $w \subset \kappa$, there is a unique countable ultrahomogeneous L'_w -structure with age $\mathbb{K}'_w$. Let $T_w^\dagger$ denote its theory.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose v and w are finite sets with $w \subset v \subset \kappa$. Then $T_w^\dagger \subset T_v^\dagger$.*

Proof. By induction, it suffices to consider the case when $v = w \cup \{\gamma\}$ for some $\gamma \in \kappa \setminus w$. By Fact 2.7, we must show (1) that $A \in \mathbb{K}'_v$ if and only if there is $D \in \mathbb{K}'_w$ so that A is an L'_v -substructure of $D \upharpoonright L_v$ and (2) that whenever $A, B \in \mathbb{K}'_w$, $\pi : A \rightarrow B$ is an embedding, and $C \in \mathbb{K}'_v$ satisfies $C = \langle A \rangle_{L'_v}^C$, then there is $D \in \mathbb{K}'_v$ so that $D = \langle B \rangle_{L'_v}^D$ and π extends to an L'_v -embedding $\pi : C \rightarrow D$.

For (1), it is clear from definitions that if $D \in \mathbb{K}'_w$ then $D \upharpoonright L_v \in \mathbb{K}'_v$. Given $A \in \mathbb{K}'_v$, we may construct a suitable L_w -structure D as follows: let the underlying set of D be $A \cup \{*\}$ and interpret the predicates and functions to extend their interpretations on A and so that $P_\gamma^D = \{*\}$ and p_γ^D is the identity on the complement of $O^D (= O^A)$ and the constant function with value $*$ on O^D . Clearly $D \in \mathbb{K}'_w$ and A is an L_v -substructure of $D \upharpoonright L_v$.

For (2), suppose $A, B \in \mathbb{K}'_w$, $\pi : A \rightarrow B$ is an embedding, and $C \in \mathbb{K}'_v$ satisfies $C = \langle A \rangle_{L'_v}^C$. The requirement that $C = \langle A \rangle_{L'_v}^C$ entails that any points of $C \setminus A$ lie in P_γ . Write $O(B) = \pi(O(A)) \sqcup E$. Define an L'_v -structure D whose underlying set is $B \cup P_\gamma(A) \cup \{*_e : e \in E\}$. Interpret the relations on D so that all symbols of L'_w agree with their interpretations on B and define $P_\gamma(D) = P_\gamma(A) \cup \{*_e : e \in E\}$. Finally, define p_γ^D by

$$p_\gamma^D(x) = \begin{cases} p_\gamma^C(a) & \text{if } x = \pi(a) \\ *_x & \text{if } x \notin \pi(O(C)). \end{cases}$$

Clearly $D \in \mathbb{K}'_v$. Extend π to a map $\pi : C \rightarrow D$ by defining π to be the identity on $P_\gamma(C)$. We claim this is an embedding: note that for all $x \in O(C)$, $p_\gamma^D(\pi(x)) = p_\gamma^C(x) = \pi(p_\gamma^C(x))$ and π obviously respects all other structure from L'_w . $\square$

Define the theory $T_\kappa^\dagger$ to be the union of $T_w^\dagger$ for all finite $w \subset \kappa$. This is a complete stable L'_κ -theory with quantifier-elimination, as these properties are inherited from the T_w^* . Fix a monster $\mathbb{M} \models T_\kappa^\dagger$ and work there.

Proposition 5.3. $\kappa_{inp}(T_\kappa^\dagger) = \kappa^+$.

Proof. For each $\alpha < \kappa$, choose distinct $a_{\alpha,\beta} \in P_\alpha(\mathbb{M})$ for all $\beta < \omega$. It is easy to check that, for all functions $f : \kappa \rightarrow \omega$, $\{p_\alpha(x) = a_{\alpha,f(\alpha)} : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is consistent and, for all $\alpha < \kappa$, $\{p_\alpha(x) = a_{\alpha,\beta} : \beta < \omega\}$ is 2-inconsistent. Thus $(p_\alpha(x) = y_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa)$, $(a_{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha < \kappa, \beta < \omega}$ forms an inp-pattern of height κ so $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T_\kappa^\dagger) \geq \kappa^+$. The upper bound $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T_\kappa^\dagger) \leq \kappa^+$ follows from the stability of $T_\kappa^\dagger$. $\square$

Proposition 5.4. *Suppose $\mathcal{D}$ is a regular ultrafilter on λ , $\kappa = \lambda^+$, and $M \models T_\kappa^\dagger$ is λ^{++} -saturated. Then $M^\lambda/\mathcal{D}$ is λ^{++} -saturated.*

Proof. Suppose $A \subseteq M^\lambda/\mathcal{D}$, $|A| = \kappa = \lambda^+$. To show that any $q(x) \in S^1(A)$ is realized, we have three cases to consider:

- (1) $q(x) \vdash x \in P_\alpha$ for some $\alpha < \kappa$
- (2) $q(x) \vdash x \notin O$ and $q(x) \vdash x \notin P_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$
- (3) $q(x) \vdash x \in O$.

It suffices to consider q non-algebraic and $A = \text{dcl}(A)$. In case (1), $q(x)$ is implied by $\{P_\alpha(x)\} \cup \{x \neq a : a \in A\}$ and in case (2), $q(x)$ is implied by $\{\neg O(x) \wedge \neg P_\alpha(x) : \alpha < \kappa\} \cup \{x \neq a : a \in A\}$. To realize $q(x)$ in case (1), for each $t \in \lambda$, choose some $b_t \in P_\alpha(M)$ such that $b_t \neq a[t]$ for all $a \in A$, which is possible by the λ^{++} -saturation of M and the fact that $|A| = \lambda^+$. Let $b = \langle b_t \rangle_{t \in \lambda}/\mathcal{D}$. By Łoś's theorem, $b \models q$. Realizing q in case (2) is entirely similar.

So now we show how to handle case (3). Fix some complete type $q(x) \in S_1(A)$ such that $q(x) \vdash x \in O$. First, we note that by possibly growing A by κ many elements, we may assume that

$$q(x) = \{x \in O\} \cup \{x \neq a : a \in O(A)\} \cup \{p_\alpha(x) = c_\alpha\},$$

since, for each $\alpha < \kappa$, either $q(x) \vdash p_\alpha(x) = c_\alpha$ for some c_α , or it only proves inequations of this form. In the latter case, we can choose some element $c_\alpha \in P_\alpha(M^\lambda/\mathcal{D})$ not in A (possible by case (1) above) and extend $q(x)$ by adding the formula $p_\alpha(x) = c_\alpha$, which will then imply all inequations of the form $p_\alpha(x) \neq a$ for any $a \in A$, and this clearly remains finitely satisfiable. So now given q in the form described above, let $X_t = \{\alpha < \kappa : M \models P_\alpha(c_\alpha[t])\}$. Let the type $q_t(x)$ be defined by

$$q_t(x) = \{x \in O\} \cup \{x \neq a[t] : a \in O(A)\} \cup \{p_\alpha(x) = c_\alpha[t] : \alpha \in X_t\}.$$

By construction, if $\alpha \neq \alpha' \in X_t$ then $M \models P_\alpha(c_\alpha[t]) \wedge P_{\alpha'}(c_{\alpha'}[t])$ so this type is consistent and over a parameter set of size at most κ , hence realized by some $b_t \in M$. Let $b = \langle b_t \rangle_{t \in \lambda}/\mathcal{D}$ and let J_α be defined by $J_\alpha = \{t \in \lambda : M \models P_\alpha(c_\alpha[t])\}$. As $q(x)$ is a consistent type, $J_\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$ and, by construction, $J_\alpha \subseteq \{t \in \lambda : M \models p_\alpha(b_t) = c_\alpha[t]\}$ so $M^\lambda/\mathcal{D} \models p_\alpha(b) = c_\alpha$. It is obvious that b satisfies all of the other formulas of q so we're done. $\square$

Corollary 5.5. *Suppose T is a complete theory, $|I| = \lambda$, $\mathcal{D}$ on I is a regular ultrafilter, and $M \models T$ is a λ^{++} -saturated model of T . The condition that $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T) > |I|^+$ is, in general, not sufficient to guarantee that $M^I/\mathcal{D}$ is not λ^{++} -compact. In particular, the condition that $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T) > |I|^+$ is, in general, not sufficient to guarantee that $M^I/\mathcal{D}$ is not λ^{++} -compact.*

Proof. Given λ , I with $|I| = \lambda$, and $\mathcal{D}$, a regular ultrafilter on I , choose any λ^{++} -saturated model of $T_{\lambda^+}^\dagger$. By Lemma 5.3, $\kappa_{\text{cdt}}(T_{\lambda^+}^\dagger) \geq \kappa_{\text{inp}}(T_{\lambda^+}^\dagger) = \lambda^{++} > |I|^+$, but, by Proposition 5.4, $M^I/\mathcal{D}$ is λ^{++} -saturated and hence λ^{++} -compact. $\square$

5.2. Loss of saturation from large sct-patterns. If T is not simple, then it has either the tree property of the first kind or the second kind - Shelah argues in [10, VI.4.7] by demonstrating that either property results in a decay of saturation with an argument tailored to each property. The preceding section demonstrates that the analogy between TP_2 and $\kappa_{\text{inp}}(T) > |I|^+$ breaks down, but we show that the analogy between TP_1 and $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) > |I|^+$ survives. The following is a straightforward adaptation of the argument of [8, Claim 8.5]:

Fact 5.6. [6, Lemma 4] Suppose $\mathcal{D}$ is a regular uniform ultrafilter on λ and $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$. There is an array of sets $\langle u_{t,\alpha} : t < \lambda, \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ satisfying the following properties:

- (1) $u_{t,\alpha} \subseteq \alpha$
- (2) $|u_{t,\alpha}| < \lambda$
- (3) $\alpha \in u_{t,\beta} \implies u_{t,\beta} \cap \alpha = u_{t,\alpha}$
- (4) if $u \subseteq \lambda^+$, $|u| < \aleph_0$ then $\{t < \lambda : (\exists \alpha)(u \subseteq u_{t,\alpha})\} \in \mathcal{D}$.

Theorem 5.7. Suppose $|I| = \lambda$ and $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$. Suppose $\kappa_{\text{sct}}(T) > |I|^+$, M is an $|I|^{++}$ -saturated model of T and $\mathcal{D}$ is a regular ultrafilter over I . Then $M^I/\mathcal{D}$ is not $|I|^{++}$ -compact.

Proof. Let $(\varphi_\alpha(x; y_\alpha) : \alpha < \lambda^+)$, $(a_\eta)_{\eta \in \lambda^{<\lambda^+}}$ be an sct-pattern. We may assume $l(y_\alpha) = k$ for all $\alpha < \lambda^+$. Let $\langle u_{t,\epsilon} : t < \lambda, \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be given as by Fact 5.6. By induction on $\alpha < \lambda^+$, we'll construct $\langle \eta_{t,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ such that $\eta_{t,\alpha} \in \lambda^\alpha$ and $\eta_{t,\alpha} \leq \eta_{t,\beta} \iff \alpha \in u_{t,\beta}$: suppose $\langle \eta_{t,\beta} : \beta < \alpha \rangle$ has been constructed. The set $\{\eta_{t,\beta} : \beta \in u_{t,\alpha}\}$ is contained in a path since, if $\beta < \beta'$ are elements of $u_{t,\alpha}$ then $\beta \in u_{t,\alpha} \cap \beta' = u_{t,\beta'}$ so $\eta_{t,\beta} \leq \eta_{t,\beta'}$ by induction. Then we can pick $\eta_{t,\alpha} \in \lambda^\alpha$ so that $\eta_{t,\beta} \leq \eta_{t,\alpha}$ if and only if $\beta \in u_{t,\alpha}$. For each $\alpha < \lambda^+$ we thus have an element $c_\alpha \in M^\lambda/\mathcal{D}$ given by $c_\alpha = \langle c_\alpha[t] : t < \lambda \rangle/\mathcal{D}$ where $c_\alpha[t] = a_{\eta_{t,\alpha}} \in M$.

Claim: $p(x) := \{\varphi_\alpha(x; c_\alpha) : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$ is consistent.

Fix any finite $u \subseteq \lambda^+$. If for some $t < \lambda$ and $\alpha < \lambda^+$, we have $u \subseteq u_{t,\alpha}$ then $\{\eta_{t,\beta} : \beta \in u\} \subseteq \{\eta_{t,\beta} : \beta \in u_{t,\alpha}\}$ which is contained in a path, hence $\{\varphi_\beta(x; c_\beta[t]) : \beta \in u\} = \{\varphi_\beta(x; a_{\eta_{t,\beta}}) : \beta \in u\}$ is consistent by definition of an sct-pattern. We know $\{t < \lambda : (\exists \alpha)(u \subseteq u_{t,\alpha})\} \in \mathcal{D}$ so the claim follows by Los's theorem and compactness.

Suppose $b = \langle b[t] \rangle_{t \in \lambda}/\mathcal{D}$ is a realization of p in $M^\lambda/\mathcal{D}$. For each $\alpha < \lambda^+$ define $J_\alpha = \{t < \lambda : M \models \varphi_\alpha(b[t], c_\alpha[t])\} \in \mathcal{D}$. For each α , pick $t_\alpha \in J_\alpha$. The map $\alpha \mapsto t_\alpha$ is regressive on the stationary set of α with $\lambda \leq \alpha < \lambda^+$. By Fodor's lemma, there's some t_* so that the set $S = \{\alpha < \lambda^+ : t_\alpha = t_*\}$ is stationary. Therefore $p_*(x) = \{\varphi_\alpha(x; a_{\eta_{t_*,\alpha}}) : \alpha \in S\}$ is a consistent partial type in M so $\{\eta_{t_*,\alpha} : \alpha \in S\}$ is contained in a path, by definition of sct-pattern. Choose an $\alpha \in S$ so that $|S \cap \alpha| = \lambda$. Then, by choice of the $\eta_{t,\alpha}$, we have $\beta \in S \cap \alpha$ implies $\eta_{t_*,\beta} \leq \eta_{t_*,\alpha}$ and therefore $\beta \in u_{t_*,\alpha}$. This shows $|u_{t_*,\alpha}| \geq \lambda$, a contradiction. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] Artem Chernikov. Theories without the tree property of the second kind. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 165(2):695–723, 2014.
- [2] Artem Chernikov and Nicholas Ramsey. On model-theoretic tree properties. 05 2015.
- [3] Fred Galvin. Chain conditions and products. *Fund. Math.*, 108(1):33–48, 1980.
- [4] Wilfrid Hodges. *Model theory*, volume 42. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, 1993.
- [5] A. S. Kechris, V. G. Pestov, and S. Todorcevic. Fraïssé limits, Ramsey theory, and topological dynamics of automorphism groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 15(1):106–189, 2005.

- [6] Juliette Kennedy and Saharon Shelah. On regular reduced products. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 67(3):1169–1177, 2002.
- [7] Byunghan Kim, Hyeung-Joon Kim, and Lynn Scow. Tree indiscernibilities, revisited. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 53(1-2):211–232, 2014.
- [8] M. Malliaris and S. Shelah. Constructing regular ultrafilters from a model-theoretic point of view. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367(11):8139–8173, 2015.
- [9] Alice Medvedev. QACFA. 08 2015.
- [10] Saharon Shelah. *Classification theory: and the number of non-isomorphic models*. Elsevier, 1990.
- [11] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [12] Saharon Shelah. Colouring and non-productivity of $\aleph_2$ -cc. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 84:153–174, 1997. arxiv:math.LO/9609218.